UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,762	08/06/2003	David S. Abdallah	PRIV-003/01US 307640-2004	1715
	7590	EXAMINER		
ATTN: PATEN		GERGISO, TECHANE		
Suite 1100 777 - 6th Street	t, NW	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	*	2437		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/635,762	ABDALLAH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	TECHANE J. GERGISO	2437	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENIAN.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	unt muion to the plate of filing a buicf	ill mat be antenad be	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the conte	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>15-21, 23-29, 32-36 and 38-52</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	1.6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Emmanuel L. Moise/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner fully considered the After Final filed on January 21, 2009 in response to the Final Office Action mailed on August 20, 2008. The applicant argues that the disclosure supports the following features of claim 23 and similarly claim 34 recited as "sending the digital certificate to the personal identification device such that functionality of the personal identification device is disabled except that the personal identification device is configured to send the digital certificate to an enrollment party during future enrollment" to overcome the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection, rejection. The applicant recites the following section from the disclosure to support the applicant's argument "The Applicants respectfully disagree. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner's reference to the specification for support for disabling functionality within the personal identification device only refers to the first portion of the last sentence of paragraph [0081] of the specification but ignores the second portion of the sentence. The sentence recites, in its entirety, that "at this point all functionality within the personal identification device is disabled, such that it is in a state waiting for future enrollment (step 107)."

The examiner disagrees with the applicant's argument and analysis because "disabling all functionality within the personal identification device except that the personal identification device is configured to send the digital certificate to an enrollment party during future enrollment" as it is claimed is different in scope to be support by the disclosure recited as "disabling all functionality within the personal identification device such that it is in a state waiting for future enrollment." For at least the above reason, the applicant's argument is not persuasive to overcome the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection, rejection and the prior art rejection and place the claims in condition for allowance.